Pacific School of Religion Berkeley Calif.

Social Questions BULLETIN

of the Methodist Federation for Social Service (unofficial), an organization which rejects the method of the struggle for profit as the economic base for society; which seeks to replace it with social-economic planning in order to develop a society without class distinctions and privileges.

VOLUME 29 NOVEMBER, 1939 NUMBER 9

A War-Time Program

Our program must now be adjusted to the effects of the war situation upon the life and future of the American people. Its objectives will be set forth by the Executive Committee after considering all the suggestions sent in by the members of the National Committee. To amplify and apply these in relation to unexpected developments which are bound to occur, it will be necessary to carry on continuous discussion in local groups. An inter-denominational Conference to express nationally the voice of those who believe that our religion demands continuous change in human society is being planned for the middle of January. The main points of emphasis are already clear. Those whose religion requires them to seek the abolition of war will work continuously to keep the United States out of the present conflict, and to get its influence exerted for the securing of a democratic peace. Those whose religion commits them to the democratic process as the means for social change will exert themselves to the utmost to protect the democratic rights of all our citizens from the inevitable attack which war-time emotions enables the forces of reaction to launch.

HOW TO KEEP OUT

There is a stronger desire to keep out of the present war than there was in 1914. But the same forces that finally broke that down are still operating. Three things took us in before: sympathy for the allied cause, enlarged by propaganda into the desire to make the world safe for democracy and to win a war to end war; the German submarine attacks, which were the official reasons stated in our declaration of war; our war trade with the allies, and its financing, which finally threatened our whole financial structure if they lost the war. Thus propaganda plus popular resentment, plus unseen economic interests, overcame the original desire to stay out. Will this happen again?

The same forces are now operating, but in different proportion. The restrictions on war trade recently enacted are a gain over 1914. They eliminate for the present the danger of submarine attacks and the pressure of financial interests. Against the stronger desire to stay out, due to the bitter experience of the last war, must be put the feeling against Hitler, which is stronger than that against the Kaiser. The new pressure of mass unemployment must be set against the restrictions on war trade. Both the President and the Secretary of War announce that no army will be sent overseas. But there are other ways to enter the war, and *Business Week* forecasts that we will get in some time in 1940.

The alignment of forces in the neutrality legislation fight throws light on the prospect. The moral emotions worked in contrary directions: one, the pacifist, isolationist desire to keep out; the other, the desire to stop Hitler. The latter was joined by national self-interest in terms of long time national defense, and by the prospect that war trade offered to check the depression which the well-to-do classes would not permit to be checked by Government spending. This combination of interests made it certain when war was declared that the embargo would be lifted and cash and carry imposed on war trade. The need of both manufacturers and farmers for markets, of labor for jobs, of merchants for business, and of financiers for a place to put idle capital, made it a political impossibility to prevent war trade to belligerents. The issue simmered down to the shutting off of arms and munitions, which was only 18% of what the allies purchased here before. The House Bill, passed in the last session, already permitted the sale of airplanes—the new factor, and the immediate need. The economic forces won, in combination, as before, with the ideal of democracy. Is the latter now due for another betrayal?

CAN WE DO IT?

We are now back to the old international law concept of neutrality. Like the Soviet we are technically willing to sell to both sides. Actually we mean to help the allies, relying on the cash and carry provisions and the British blockade to make it impossible for Germany to buy here. If she can get something by a round about way through neutrals, we will take the profits on that too.

This is a better protection against the consequences of war trade than we had in 1914-17. How effective is it? Is the desire for profit, and the need for profit tamed and under control? The first attempt to break through the cash restriction by substituting 90 days credit for cash on the barrelhead, has been defeated by popular protest. But the same interests who tried that are now hoping that the clause which provides that insurance does not constitute an American interest in goods or ships will afford them a loophole; and the British Minister of Supply naturally says they are examining the Bill to see if there is not a possibility of getting around the cash restriction by arrangements with private business. The *Wall Street Journal* has hopes. The attempt to evade the carry restriction by transfer to foreign registry, and the official support it has secured, indicates the necessity to continually watch and expose attempts to

evade or change the restrictions on war trade designed to lessen the risk of our being drawn into war.

THE DANGER POINTS

Popular support will gather behind such attempts if and when there is any danger of Hitler winning, and if the war lasts until the allies' cash is gone and orders and jobs begin to fall off. War trade on a cash basis has its own way of producing economic pressures on the side of our entering the war. The anticipation of immediate orders which are not forthcoming has already created a small boom with no base. The concentration of orders on airplanes and a few other things, and the need of conserving cash for a possibly long struggle, is already reducing British purchases of basic necessities that we have been supplying. The prosperity we get from war orders will be very spotty. The effects of the transfer of British and French securities here to pay for their orders, along with additional transfer of gold, will load us up still more with idle capital. The net result will be an increase in our total economic insecurity, a psychological situation which always brings war nearer.

To offset these tendencies it would be necessary to make much larger Government expenditures for social gains, whereas the reactionaries who succeeded in limiting these in the last session of Congress expect to do worse in 1940. Those who seek to check the rise of a war spirit in this nation will need to be able to defeat reaction at this point and to protect the living standards of the people by exposing, and leading them to stop, all war profiteering as soon as it begins.

If the war lasts the cold-blooded military experts have a formula for the time when the economic and propaganda pressures will actually begin to take us in. It is the ratio between our supply of the instruments of war to the allied man-power available for their use. When the production flow of war materials from our plants becomes greater than the capacity of their armies, there will be both need for our man-power and propaganda to get it. The danger to democracy will then suddenly become very acute in the headlines. Those who would expose and resist this must know their economic facts. It is of no more avail to shout "keep out of war" than it was to vote that way in 1916. If the underlying forces are again working as they were then, they will take us in. The first step in getting them under control is to continually explain to the people exactly what is happening. A later bulletin will analyze our war-time economy.

WHAT ABOUT CHINA?

Since England now has no war supplies to spare for Japan, that country needs to draw more heavily upon us than even our present 54% of her imported materials for war. Our new war-trade legislation does not apply, for the legal fiction of an undeclared war still remains. If that situation continues, only an embargo can end our partnership in the invasion of China. If Japan declares war our present legislation will still help Japan more than China, for she can only get supplies through neutrals willing to run the blockade, while Japan has both cash and ships. The only prevention would be a Presidential ban on scrap iron and oil on the ground of our own needs, plus discrimination under the tariff law when our trade treaty ends in January. Our present protests to Japan are entirely in terms of our own trade interests and lead either to war or a compromising assent to Japanese control in China. Our moral obligation to China calls clearly for a renewed demand for an embargo on war supplies to Japan until she takes her armies out of China.

INCITEMENTS TO WAR

Incitements to war will naturally be continuous. There is and will be propaganda, with its inevitable atrocity stories, to be exposed. There will be incidents infringing upon our rights, and inhuman deeds, against which our emotions will need to be steeled. There are sympathies to be watched lest they betray us. Those responsible for forming public opinion will need constantly to ask some questions and answer them from the unfolding facts. What are the war aims of the allies? Can the people who helped destroy democracy in Austria, Spain and Czecho-Slovakia do anything for it now? Can Hitler and Hitlerism be stopped by war? Will the victory of the allies produce anything better than it did at Versailles with all its consequences? How can a repetition, in even worse form, of the cycle which produced the present disaster, be prevented?

A NEW DEVIL

A dangerous feature in recent developments is the propaganda of incitement against the Soviet Union. It fairly shrieks from the headlines and thunders from the editorials. Stalin has replaced Hitler for most of the American people, as the devil to be feared. Stories are told one week on the front page, and the facts which deny them are the next week buried in the back of the papers. The Soviets had betrayed and abandoned China to its fate, we were told. Now come the facts concerning increased supplies. Tons of Russian gold were on their way to Germany. Now it appears they are in Dutch banks for Soviet purchases in the United States. Yet our liberals, so shocked by the change in Soviet policy, are still prepared to believe the worst. Usually they do not even mention, let alone assess, Chamberlain's part in that change. Our Government talks in sterner tones to Stalin than to Hitler. It says nothing when two score of our ships are interned by the allies; it protests when one is held in a Soviet port.

All this provides the emotional background for what? Among the possibilities is the cry for a holy war against the pagan Nazis and the atheistic Communists. The Vatican has laid the groundwork for it. Two of our most widely read columnists are calling for a union of all forces to beat back the barbarians of the East before they destroy all the values of civilization. In the event of an alliance between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia the cry for a holy war would develop hysteria overnight in this nation. God is a more powerful sanction for modern mass slaughter than democracy.

There is another and more cold-blooded prospect for the use of the moral emotions now being aroused against Russia, and it coincides with the property interest and the fear of social change suddenly revealed by this animus. The plan of a section of the British Tories is to restore a reactionary Government in Germany, the kind that we helped to overthrow in 1918. There is talk of bolster-

ing this by a monarchical Catholic state in central Europe. In any event a reactionary Germany is to be turned Eastward again, looking toward that attack upon the Soviet Union which is the historic necessity of the Tory imperialists. In this eventuality the support of the United States in one way or another is sought.

In these circumstances those who feel an obligation to pass moral judgments on the Soviet Union must realize the risk involved. It is the same risk which was taken by those who passed moral judgments upon Hitler, and they took precautions to get them executed without war. The least that can be done by those who stand in a similar position in relation to the Soviet Union is to see that their judgments are exact and are based on all the facts.

SOME FACTS

Most of those who now put the actions of the Soviet on the same plane with those of Hitler, have read only the newspaper case against the Soviet. Their side is now available in English through the speeches of Molotov. He declares their main motivation to be self-protection, with the hope that their course will make for peace. On questions of fact the British point of view, more hard-headed than ours despite their more vital interests, supports the Russians on some points. Chamberlain's latest speech on Nov. 9 says: "On the other hand, the pact between Germany and the Soviet Union has given indeed great advantages for the Soviet Union, but it has brought only humiliation and loss for Germany." Chamberlain has officially justified the Soviet entry into Poland as a defense measure. And this was not merely a tactical move on the score of neutrality. The additional fact that he has debarred the Polish Government in Paris from making any claim to the territory involved indicates his conclusion that this Government has no moral or legal title to territory which it took by force from the Soviet contrary to the Versailles decision.

This places the Soviet action against Hitler rather than the Polish Government. The technical point in the question of aggression is whether the border was crossed before or after the Polish Government had ceased to function. The correspondent of the London *Times,* who was in the area at the moment, states that the Government was out of commission. This left the territory either to Hitler or the Soviet, from which it was originally taken.

Concerning the charge of a previous plan of partition, Gedye, the Moscow correspondent of the New York *Times,* with a long and honorable experience in Vienna and Prague, affirms that he can find no proof of it. The record of the Soviet of keeping their pledge to Czecho-Slovakia, publicly confirmed by members of that Government, coincides with the charge of the total political opposition to Chamberlain in England, including many conservatives, that he, and not the Soviet Union, was responsible for the breakdown of the negotiations between them. If this is correct it left the Soviet faced with continuous manoeuvres against them with no alternative but to protect themselves as best they could. Their moves can only be understood in the light of the fear psychology developed by continuous attacks upon them, and threats against them, which are met by Lenin's strategy of playing off one enemy against another in turn.

This explains the policy in relation to the Baltic States and Finland. Weeks before this developed the Ambassadors of these states in Washington told the *New Republic* correspondent that the key to Soviet policy was the impossibility of defending Leningrad as long as the approaches to the Gulf of Finland were controlled by other powers. This is equally true of its nearness to the Finnish border, and it involves the whole northern industrial section of Russia proper. It is the fear of future attack from either or both Germany or Great Britain which dominates the situation. Those who interpret Soviet action only in terms of power politics, and talk of socialist imperialism, are thinking too narrowly in their habitual pattern. Those who think that Russia might have stayed within her own borders usually ignore tactical necessities in the face of enemies in the field, and generally forget that a socialist state in a capitalist world is still subject to the laws of State nature. Since all States sin the question is, are these sinners above the others, or below the others, in this modern Jerusalem? The answer to that must be found in the terms of their contracts with, and the future development of, those smaller States which of necessity must either be in the orbit of Germany, Great Britain, or the Soviet until the day when there is a commonwealth of socialized nations in Europe. Meantime the terms of the Soviet concessions in the Baltic States and Finland should be compared with Hitler's terms in Czecho-Slovakia, Britain's in India and ours in Cuba.

OUR DEMOCRACY

The question of the outcome of the moral emotions now being aroused against the Soviet also has another bearing. Here they are being translated into anti-Communism, and this is being used under the leadership of Dies in a new red hunt which promises, under other leadership, to be more intelligent, as well as more ruthless, than that under Mitchell Palmer after the last war. The foundations of our democracy are being assailed under the cry of saving it from the reds. Even if we manage to stay out of the war it is clear that we have a continuous and difficult job to protect our democratic rights from the massed attack of reaction, using war-time feelings for its dynamic. A later Bulletin will deal with this question.

A DEMOCRATIC PEACE

Those who seek a democratic peace must begin to work for it now and must work for it continuously. Because of the contribution of our economic resources to the allied cause, as well as because of our security and our professed ideals, we have an obligation as a neutral to secure at the earliest possible moment a conference of all the interested nations to face the basic issues involved in the war. They are three: the ending of aggression and imperialist domination with restitution for the dispossessed nations and minorities; disarmament; meeting the economic needs of all nations by reciprocal arrangements. There is no hope of avoiding a repetition of the present situation unless an approach is made to the settlement of these issues. To this end the people of the United States should continuously address themselves.

HARRY F. WARD.

News from the Field

Social Planning and the Social Creed. The Social Ideals of the Churches, as adopted at the Quadrennial Meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, December 8, 1932 (before the New Deal came into being), contained this statement: "The churches should stand for social planning and control of the credit and monetary systems and the economic processes for the common good." The Social Creed of the former Methodist Episcopal Church, South, as found in the 1938 Discipline, has the same statement on social planning as given above, yet the Social Creed of the Methodist Church, adopted at Kansas City, Mo., on May 9, 1939, makes no reference to this vital subject.

In order to rectify this situation the New York East Annual Conference, at its Special Session on October 27, 1939, memorialized the General Conference of 1940 to add to the Social Creed of the Church the following: "The Methodist Church stands for social planning and democratic control of the economic processes for the common good."

Federation members, will you do your part? If your Annual Conference meets before General Conference, will you endeavor to get it to adopt this memorial, and to instruct its delegates to ask for the adoption of the memorial by the General Conference? If your Annual Conference has already met, will you ask your delegates to support this memorial?

Conscription and Silver Shirts. "We stand opposed to the various conscription bills such as the May bill offered in the last Congress, which would clamp down upon us any sort of military dictatorship, and would destroy those democratic liberties upon which our national security rests; and we oppose all national defense bills which deny men the rights guaranteed under the Constitution. Against all hate provoking, race insulting groups, be they Bund or Silver Shirt, Methodism hurls the titanic forces of its witness of the spirit. We have neither part nor parcel in any Christian Front that turns its back on the Christian faith in brotherhood and democracy."—*Ohio Conference, September, 1939.*

Freedom. "We want freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of the pulpit and academic freedom. Without these Democracy itself goes. We are alarmed by violations of these freedoms even when committed by our own representatives in our communities and at our own institutions."—*Iowa-Des Moines Conference, September, 1939.*

Profits and Living Standards. "We believe that profit as the dominant motive and driving force of industry is incompatible with our Christian ideal of sacrificial service. We are opposed to the putting of profit above personality. We believe in the abundant life for all people. Moreover, we think that no one is entitled to the luxuries of life while many are deprived of the very necessities. We are our brother's keepers.

"All workers should have a living annual wage. The principles of conciliation and arbitration should be applied in industrial disputes. Peaceful picketing should be permitted. We believe that the worker has a property right in his job and a responsibility to the industry by which he makes a living. We are opposed to the use of violence by either the employee or the employer. The church must champion the cause of the underprivileged and the dispossessed, and insist that the good things of life must be provided for all of God's children."—*Iowa-Des Moines Conference, September, 1939.*

The Mail Bag

"The Federation was never more needed than now."—C. S. (Ohio).

"We are glad to have the Federation representing us at the forefront of the struggle."—C. H. P. (Michigan).

"I want to commend you on your work and on your little paper. I enjoy it very much and give it to another Methodist living nearby—also a believer in what you stand for."—D. H. M. (Washington).

"I sincerely hope the (financial) campaign will be a success, for there will be greater need than ever for the Federation in the new Church."—R. B. T. (New York).

"Every progressive Methodist should be a member of the Federation. I certainly want to be a member and so enclosed is my application blank."—G. M. H. (New York).

Federation Finances

Our deficit is still around $1,000! How can we meet it?

C. R. M. (New York) writes: "I don't know how the deficit of $1,000 can be met, but here is my check for $50 to help."

R. F. W. (Iowa), who sent $20, writes: "If you had 49 people who would give $20 apiece you would have your $1,000." Will you be one of the 49?

Social Questions BULLETIN

issued monthly, except July and August. The general policies of this publication are determined by the Executive Committee of the Methodist Federation for Social Service, subject to approval by the National Committee of the Federation. The selection of topics and material is committed to the Secretaries, who are responsible to the Federation and to the public for its accuracy.

Membership $1.00 per year
Special rate to student groups.

SECRETARIES
Harry F. Ward
Charles C. Webber

OFFICERS
Bishop Francis J. McConnell, *President*
Harris Franklin Rall, *Vice-President*
Gilbert Q. LeSourd, *Secretary-Treasurer*

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

E. Raymond Attebery	Juanita Jackson
Lester W. Auman	David D. Jones
James C. Baker	John C. Lazenby
Hayes Beall	Halford E. Luccock
Edgar Blake	Chester A. Smith
Gilbert S. Cox	Ralph B. Urmy
Margaret Forsyth	Edgar M. Wahlberg

The METHODIST FEDERATION *for* SOCIAL SERVICE
150 Fifth Avenue, New York City

Entered as second-class matter January 21, 1919, at the Postoffice at New York, N. Y., under Act of August 24, 1912.

312